

Ser. No. 09/941,884

7

60003206-1

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion.

Claims 2 and 11 have been allowed.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 10 and 12-14 have been rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over newly applied Arquilevich et al. (6,137,592, "Arquilevich") in view of Dunand (6398334).

Claims 7 and 16 have been rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Dunand and Maeda.

Claims 8-9, 17-18, and 20-21 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Dunand and Yen.

Claims 6, 15 and 22 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Dunand and Takagi.

The rejection of Claims 1, 6, 8-10, 15 and 17-22 has been mooted by the cancellation without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter of these claims, to advance this case to issue.

The rejection of Claims 3, 4, 5 and 7 has been mooted by the amendment of these claims to depend from allowed Claim 2.

The rejection of Claims 12-14 and 16 has been mooted by the amendment of these claims to depend from allowed Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 12-14 and 16 are in condition for allowance, since they depend from an allowed base claim.

Entry of the amendments to Claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 12-14 and 16 is respectfully requested under Rule 1.116, since the amendments put the claims in condition for allowance, and therefore reduce the number of any remaining issues for consideration on appeal.

Ser. No. 09/941,884

7

60003206-1

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following discussion.

Claims 2 and 11 have been allowed.

Claims Rejections - 35 USC 103

Claims 1, 3-5, 10 and 12-14 have been rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over newly applied Arquilevich et al. (6,137,592, "Arquilevich") in view of Dunand (6398334).

Claims 7 and 16 have been rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Dunand and Maeda.

Claims 8-9, 17-18, and 20-21 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Dunand and Yen.

Claims 6, 15 and 22 stand rejected as allegedly being unpatentable over Arquilevich in view of Dunand and Takagi.

The rejection of Claims 1, 6, 8-10, 15 and 17-22 has been mooted by the cancellation without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter of these claims, to advance this case to issue.

The rejection of Claims 3, 4, 5 and 7 has been mooted by the amendment of these claims to depend from allowed Claim 2.

The rejection of Claims 12-14 and 16 has been mooted by the amendment of these claims to depend from allowed Claim 11.

Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 12-14 and 16 are in condition for allowance, since they depend from an allowed base claim.

Entry of the amendments to Claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 12-14 and 16 is respectfully requested under Rule 1.116, since the amendments put the claims in condition for allowance, and therefore reduce the number of any remaining issues for consideration on appeal.

Ser. No. 09/941,884

8

60003206-1

CONCLUSION

The outstanding rejections should be withdrawn. All outstanding rejections have been mooted. Applicants respectfully submit that the application should be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Larry K. Roberts
Registration No. 28,464

Dated: 2.9.2007

Law Offices of Larry K. Roberts, Inc.
P.O. Box 8569
Newport Beach, CA 92658-8569
Telephone (949) 250-6008
Facsimile (949) 250-6012